

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (US 6,744,482).

Claims 2 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 contain allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, and 16 to further define the invention, canceled claims 9 and 10, and added new claim 21. Accordingly, claims 18 and 11-21 are pending for further consideration.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3-10, 13, 14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al. (US 6,744,482), and claims 2 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 15, and 16, and hence dependent claims 2-4, 6-14, and 17-20.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a floating line including at least two conductive lines adjacent to a lower portion of the data line, wherein a part of the floating line is overlapped with the data line.”

Likewise, independent claim 15, as amended, recites an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a floating line including at least two conductive lines overlapping the data line and formed on a same plane as the gate line.” Similarly, independent claim 16, as amended, recites a method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “forming a gate line and a floating line including at least two conductive lines on the first substrate.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Matsumoto et al. clearly teaches, in FIGs. 8, 11, 18A-18K, and 20, formation of protrusions 299a, 299b, 300a, and 300b on opposing sides of the data lines 24. For example, Matsumoto et al. explicitly teaches (col. 12, lines 46-49) “[p]rotrusions 299a and 299b are formed in at least one of the common electrode wiring portions 26a and 26b such that the data line 24 to be formed in a later step is put *therebetween* along the extending direction of the data line” (emphasis added). In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsumoto et al. explicitly discloses, in FIG. 25A, protrusions 300a and 300b that extend along sides of the data line 24. Moreover, although Matsumoto et al. discloses, in FIG. 26A, a floating film 300, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsumoto et al. is completely silent with regard to the floating film 300 being formed as two conductive lines overlapping the data line 24.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsumoto et al. fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a floating line including at least two conductive lines adjacent to a lower portion of the data line, wherein a part of the floating line is overlapped with the data line,” as recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-8 and 11-14. Likewise, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsumoto et al. fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, “a floating line including at least two conductive lines overlapping the data line and formed on a same plane as the gate line,” as recited by amended independent claim 15. Similarly, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsumoto et al. fails to teach or suggest a method of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “forming a gate line and a floating line including at least two conductive lines on the first substrate,” as recited by amended independent claim 16, and hence dependent claims 17-20.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Matsumoto et al. neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claims 1, 15, and 16, and hence dependent claims 2-8, 11-14, and 17-20

New Claim 21

Applicants have added new claim 21 to further define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 21 is allowable at least because of its dependency from independent claim 1, and for the individual features that claims 21 recites.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: April 5, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000